

## REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 are being deleted due to the examiner's view as being unpatentable over Shen et al. (patent 4,659,087) in view of Nguyen et al. (patent 5,628,514) and Robinson et al. (patent 6,776,415 B2). New claims 3-17 are added to support the new distinguished "Indian Double Super 9 Casino Game". Please refer to the diagram for the explanations below:

The differences between our invention and Shen et al. are:

1. We use 12 decks or 288 cards total. Shen et al. uses a single deck or 52 cards total.
2. We play from Ace to Six only; 7 to K are removed. Shen et al. plays from Ace to King.
3. Under our invention, any four of kind and any four of kind are the same hand, thus it is a tie or push. Under Shen et al., Ace four of kind beats any four of kind from Two to King.
4. Under our invention: A & 8 = 9, 6 & 3 = 9, 5 & 4 = 9; all of these combinations are equal. Under Shen et al., A & 8 = 9 is the highest hand, K & 9 = 9 is the second highest hand, Q & 9 =

9 is the third highest hand,  $6 \& 3 = 9$  is the lower hand,  $5 \& 4 = 9$  is the lowest hand.

5. We play with no pair ( $A \& A = 2$  point,  $6 \& 6 = 2$  point,  $5 \& 5 = 0$  point,  $4 \& 4 = 8$  point,  $3 \& 3 = 6$  point). Shen et al. plays with any pair ( $A \& A =$  pair Ace,  $K \& K =$  pair King,  $Q \& Q =$  pair Queen,  $6 \& 6 =$  pair Six,  $5 \& 5 =$  pair Five,  $4 \& 4 =$  pair Four,  $3 \& 3 =$  pair Three).

6. Our copy hand is a tie or push. For Shen et al., when there is a copy hand, Banker win.

The differences between our invention and Nguyen et al. are:

1. We play with 12 decks or 288 cards. Nguyen et al. plays with 15 decks or 360 cards.
2. We play with four cards: Front with two cards, Back with two cards; and players have more options to play the hand. Nguyen et al. plays with only two cards: no Front, no Back; players have only one way to play.
3. Under our invention, any four of kind is the highest hand. Under Nguyen et al., 12 points ( $6 \& 6$ ) is the highest hand.

4. Under our invention, 0 point is the lower hand. Under Nguyen et al., 2 point is the lower hand.

5. Under our invention,  $6 \& 6 = 2$  point,  $6 \& 5 = 1$  point,  $5 \& 5 = 0$  point. Under Nguyen et al.,  $6 \& 6 = 12$  point which is the highest hand,  $6 \& 5 = 11$  point which is the second highest hand,  $5 \& 5 = 10$  point which is the third highest hand.

The comparison between our invention and Robinson et al. is similar to the comparison between our invention and Shen et al.